



Research and Reference Service

OVERSEAS REACTION TO THE CUBAN SITUATION (As of 3 p.m.)

R-123-62 (A)

October 25, 1962

This is a research report, not a statement of Agency policy

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR

REVIEWED by RB. Hough DATE 2/16/68

(X) RELEASE () DECLASSIFY
() RECLASS () DECLASSIFY
() DECLASSIFY () DECLASSIFY

FCI, EO OF 22, CHINA, FOR

() CLASSIFY AS _____, OADR
() DOWNGRADE TO () S OF () C, OADR

SUMMARY

Continued comment clearly indicates a pattern of consistency with few significant changes in previous positions on the U.S. quarantine of Cuba. There is some evidence of increasing support in some parts of Western Europe and an increasing tendency in supporting comment to hedge with certain reservations and to call for an immediate solution through the UN or high-level diplomatic channels.

General support of the U.S. position continued in most of Western Europe with evidence of increasing support, particularly from Britain and Scandinavia. An increased emphasis on the possibilities of a negotiated settlement by many commentators was noted.

Latin American support remained firm but there were indications that there were limits on the type of U.S. action they would fully condone.

Comment from staunch U.S. allies in the Far East continued its support, while Japanese and Malayan comment continued to be ambivalent. For the first time, critical comment appeared from the leftwing in Indonesia. Calls for UN action remained strong.

Comment from Africa increased and continued to be unfavorable. Themes included doubts of American honesty in assessing the danger, the existence of U.S. military bases around the Soviet Union, the illegality of "blockade," and support for self-determination by small nations.

Soviet propaganda continued to rely on vehemence with charges that the U.S. was following a dangerous and aggressive path in its relations with Cuba. The entire situation is treated as a U.S. - Cuba rather than a U.S. - USSR confrontation.

WESTERN EUROPE

Generally sympathetic understanding of the US position on Cuba continued to be extensive with evidence of increasing support, particularly from Britain and Scandinavia. A shift in emphasis was evident with many commentators focusing increasing attention on the possibilities of negotiations and the importance of the forthcoming UN debate. Some critical voices continued to be heard, apparently conditioned by war anxiety and doubts concerning the justification for US action.

Basic understanding of the US position on Cuba and emphasis on the need for Western solidarity in the crisis continued to be the dominant notes in Western European media. In Britain and Scandinavia, where war anxiety had prompted a mixed reception of the news, there were signs of growing support owing to strong US documentation of its case and statements by political leaders. Thus the London Daily Telegraph (conservative), which had earlier been critical, said that "...more sympathetic understanding of her /America's/ case is being widely shown", attributing this to "the mounting evidence of the /Soviet/ diplomatic deceit... and the reckless provocation of which the Russians have been guilty." Copenhagen's financial Boersen represented a sizable portion of Scandinavian opinion in asserting that "it is a threat to world peace when the Soviet Union equips Cuba with atomic rockets as it has evidently done... The USA's action makes it possible to clarify who wishes to make Cuba a threat to world peace."

Elsewhere, support continued strongest in Germany; the pro-Socialist Frankfurter Rundschau asserted: "If Kennedy had tolerated the Soviet activities in Cuba he would have lost face throughout the world." One influential German paper, the right-center Deutsche Zeitung (Duesseldorf) called upon the allies to match US sacrifice and self-discipline. In Italy, support came from the center and the right. In Spain, weight was given to the "practically unanimous" OAS support of the United States. In Belgium, Het Volk (Catholic, Ghent) declared that Soviet activity in Cuba "goes beyond what the US can tolerate."

In the absence of an immediate and violent Soviet response, attention was focused more sharply on the possibility of a solution through diplomatic negotiations which European media generally assumed and fervently hoped would take place. In this speculation it was widely emphasized that both the US and the USSR had recourse to the United Nations. Parisian papers, strongly echoed elsewhere, seized on the hopes for a compromise. Such statements as: "Negotiation should save us from this bilateral suicide" (right-wing Aurore) and "the choice is between compromise... and total war" (financial Les Echos) give the flavor of this reaction. Munich's left-center Süddeutsche Zeitung thought "the Soviet declaration still elastic enough to make us hope for negotiations."

An indication of what the terms of negotiation should include was perhaps to be seen in the occasional mention of US bases on the Soviet perimeter and questioning of the distinction between these and the Soviet sites in Cuba. "It is just possible", wrote the conservative Times (London), "that they [the US and USSR] may consider a bargain whereby each does away with a forward base or two." Opposition to this line was exemplified by Hamburg's independent Die Welt: "The argument has been advanced... that what Cuba is to the Americans, western rocket bases in Turkey and Italy are to the Soviets. However, Turkey and Italy have sought US protection against Soviet aggression. It is Moscow which has repeatedly threatened with rockets."

The basis of critical European comment is clearly war anxiety. independent Helsingin Sanomat spoke for many others in stating that "one cannot help feeling that the danger of the often-discussed 'miscalculation' has grown." Several papers continued to stress the alleged part played in Kennedy's action by domestic pressures and the election campaign. The Yorkshire Post (conservative, Leeds) and independent Le Combat (Paris) expressed fears that "US hotheads" or "The Pentagon" might assert more influence if the situation deteriorates. Criticism of the tardiness of US action was featured by the Italian right and in Spain and Portugal, but was also the subject of occasional comment elsewhere. Thus the Bonn General-Anzeiger (pro-government): "Questions as to why the American did not take action in little Cuba before it was transformed into a Soviet base will not improve our mood." It is evident also that lack of US consultation prior to the action still rankles with a considerable number of Europeans.

LATIN AMERICA

Extensive coverage continues in all the media of the Area. Official and public support of the US position is overwhelmingly dominant. Some major organizations have issued statements in support of the US. Only the Communists and some minor groups have expressed opposition.

Media coverage of the US quarantine and the Cuban crisis has been so extensive that in Mexico, a nation that has not always supported the US to the fullest, President Lopez Mateos' return from the Far East was pushed off the front pages. And some radio stations, even in those countries which still maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba, have carried major newspaper editorials supporting the position and actions of the US.

Media reaction is still overwhelmingly favorable to the US, although some segments have taken either a neutral or leftist position. The "legal" stance taken by the Mexican and Brazilian governments tends to support the US position even though it does not constitute concrete immediate support for definitive action. Half the nations of the Hemisphere, however, have offered military or other material support of the quarantine operation. Some major organizations have issued strong statements of support for the US action. First pride in Hemispheric unity has tended to mellow somewhat upon further consideration of the consequences which could result from firmness against the "menace" of communism in the area. The Communists, of course, and a few minor groups have held demonstrations in opposition to the US position and the Communist press has followed the Moscow line.

Material support by the American nations is still being expanded. Half the Hemisphere has offered either direct military support by operational units or the use of base facilities. Argentina has officially offered naval units to participate in the blockade. Honduras has made available a squadron of military planes and an infantry battalion. Guatemala has alerted its army to "occupy appropriate positions" in the operation. Venezuela and Colombia have "alerted" their armed forces. Other nations have qualified their support to exclude approval of the use of force.

The Secretary-General of the Inter-American Labor Organization (ORIT) issued a statement backing President Kennedy's action. Delegates to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting in Mexico City declared their individual support (in addition to a milder official statement) for the US actions. The Costa Rican Legislative Assembly passed a motion supporting President Kennedy and the US by a vote of 52 to one. (The lone dissenter was a Communist Deputy.) Radio Cadena Nacional reported that Senators of the usually pro-Castro Liberal Revolutionary Movement of Colombia "condemned the establishment of Russian bases in Cuba and announced their support for President Kennedy's measures." A leader of the leftist non-Communist APRA party of Peru said "Cuba should be returned to democracy, and all Latin American countries should unite to that end, not leaving the US to act alone." Strong statements of support for the US by participants in the Inter-American Press Association meeting in Santiago have helped create favorable climate of opinion. Guillermo Martinez Marquez, exiled director of El Pais (defunct Havana newspaper) and ex-President of the Inter-American Press Association, said "The crisis situation that we are living through has not been provoked by the action of President Kennedy but by the tortuous maneuvers of the Kremlin." In Argentina, La Prensa carried statements by civic and political groups supporting the US and condemning Cuba for violating the Rio de Janeiro Pact of 1947. The Ecuadorean Congress passed a resolution supporting the US action on Cuba and repudiating Cuban transformation into a base for the advancement of Soviet communism into the Hemisphere. Leaders of the Catholic church strongly supported the US. La Religion (Catholic daily of Caracas, Venezuela) declared: "The Soviet menace has been recognized [and] is threatening the continent with clearly offensive arms."

Some typical public and official quotations reflect the general support of the Hemisphere for the US. Commenting on the favorable Chilean, Mexican and Brazilian vote on the OAS resolution, El Mercurio of Santiago, Chile said "The final result of this attitude cannot be other than the rupture of relations with Cuba." The US, said El Pais of Montevideo, Uruguay "has acted with great prudence. Many will say the wait has been excessive, but let us not forget that the US is accustomed to entering wars late, badly prepared, and winning them." La Cronica of Lima, Peru editorialized "all America responds to the Red threat." La Prensa of Buenos Aires, in an editorial, stated that "if Russia's cold-blooded intent at domination does not abate [then] . . . the answer can only be given by the US." La Republica of Bogota, Colombia stated that "In this emergency, Colombia is ready to fulfill its commitments with the other American States,

with God, and with history." The Minister of Government of Panama, echoed President Chiari's support of the US and blamed the crisis on the "power thirst and insanity of one man, Fidel Castro." Many governments have taken precautionary measures to maintain public order, in the event of demonstrations or disorders. La Republica of Caracas, Venezuela (reflecting government views) declared that "the photographic proof obtained by North American planes are irrefutable evidence of a threat to the security of American nations. Everyone knows that Castro is not the real danger, but that the Soviet bases controlled by the Soviets constitute the threat." Excelsior of Mexico City editorialized on "the Khrushchev plan to attack the continent" and added that this plan "was going on while subjugated Cuba was being used as a springboard for an imminent bloodying of American soil." Correo de la Tarde of Buenos Aires perhaps reflected the general feeling in the Hemisphere when it editorialized that "Our world does not want war. It wishes to live in peace but not at the cost of slavery."

In Brazil yesterday growing divergence developed between the official position and the views expressed by the non-administration dominated press. The "soft" official line is best summarized in the following actions and pronouncements: 1) the proposal by Brazil in the UN General Assembly of a "nuclear free zone" to embrace Latin America and Africa, 2) an official Brazilian Government statement that "it does not lend support to the use of force which may violate an independent country's territorial integrity," 3) a plea by President Joao Goulart "for action that would ease world tension," 4) the recommendation of Prime Minister Hernes Lima to "resolve the issue peacefully through the intermediary of the United Nations." However, violent debate of the Cuban issue in the Chamber of Deputies of the important state of Sao Paulo showed that the official position found no echo there except among a few leftist members of that body. Said its acting chairman, Conceicao da Costa Neves, "No one with a sane conscience can applaud that vulgar, criminal Fidel Castro. The position assumed by John Kennedy is a position of defense of the Hemisphere, it is a position of defense of our country." Costa Neves also appeared on television the same day and in the same vein. Additionally, the city's most influential daily, O Estado do Sao Paulo, expressed solidarity with the Hemispheric position adopted without reservation by the great majority of the other Latin American nations.

In Cuba, the media continue to comment heavily on the US actions. Prensa Latina carried extensive reports on statements and demonstrations in support of Cuba by Latin American leftist front organizations. The theme of peaceful solution was stressed by television commentator

Luis Gomez Wanguemert when he said: "The Soviet Union is anxious to avoid taking precipitate steps and to find a peaceful solution to every conflict." Significantly he repeated Castro's statement on peace contained in the Premier's speech of October 23. Radio Havana noted the "proverbial submissiveness of the OAS" and applauded the fact that "the peoples of [the] continent have begun to demonstrate their support for the Cuban Revolution in various ways." In typical Communist jargon the radio commentary concluded: "... to be against Cuba is to be with fratricidal war. To be with Cuba,..., is to be for peace and happiness of mankind." A CMQ Television report again refers to a recent opinion poll conducted in the US: "Recent surveys have established that the great majority of the North American people are against aggression on Cuba...." In conclusion, the commentary attempted to downgrade US intelligence collection efforts when it said: "They have been unable to learn the location, the number, and the real range of the defensive weapons which we have."

Straight news coverage remained heavy, but editorial reaction dropped to a relatively moderate level with comment still lacking from Burma and Cambodia. Media and official support continued to emanate from the Republic of China, South Korea, South Viet-Nam, Thailand and the Philippines. Calls remained strong for UN action, but sophisticated comment from Japan and Malaya indicated the belief that such action could only be forthcoming from the General Assembly due to a probable Soviet veto in the Security Council. Left-wing criticism from Indonesia of the President's policy entered for the first time, while comment from Japan and Malaya in general maintained its ambivalence, refusing to take a real stand on the crisis.

Coverage

Straight news coverage of the crisis by area media remains heavy, but editorial comment has dropped off considerably following the adjustment to the shock aroused by the President's speech. Media comment has yet to be reported from Burma and Cambodia, while the left-wing press of Indonesia belatedly has begun to level a variety of criticisms at the U.S. policy step.

Repeated Support

Strong, unqualified support for the United States, both official and media, continues to typify the reaction of the Republic of China (Taiwan), South Korea, South Viet-Nam, Thailand and the Philippines. A slight undercurrent of fear that the U.S. might be persuaded to compromise its firm stand was indicated, however, in a comment from the Korean daily Chosun Ilbo which stated: "...the U.S. action should become the landmark of efforts to crush all threats arising in chain reaction, and should become the permanent model of U.S. determination to tolerate no more disputes caused by communism. To this end, we firmly believe that the whip once taken up should not be put aside until the end." Such comment is typical of the attitude of staunchly anti-Communist allies of the West in the Far East, reflecting their long-held desire for more aggressive U.S. action against Communist advances both in the Far East and elsewhere.

UN Action

The desire for action by the UN to alleviate the situation remains a strong theme in area comment, but sophisticated editorialists and commentators have noted the futility of Security Council action in the face of a Soviet veto. Comment thus has begun to speculate on the possibilities of action by the General Assembly. In the words of the influential Straits Times of Kuala Lumpur: "The Security Council is going to be entirely impotent, of course, because Russia and America both have the right of veto. How long will it take the General Assembly to get Cuba on its agenda?" Opinions of a similar nature were expressed by commentators in Japan's largest dailies.

Ambivalent Criticism

Criticism of the Administration's action remains prominent in reaction from Japan and Malaya. Now for the first time Indonesia's left-wing press has begun to level sharp criticism against the U.S., featuring the charge that the President is triggering a nuclear war. In a more balanced presentation, the left-of-center Djakarta daily Duta Majaraka opined that "we do not want the United States to interfere with Cuban domestic affairs. On the other hand, we regard it as unacceptable for the Soviet Union to build a rocket base in Cuba". The paper went on to conclude that "...if Cuba is really an aggressive rocket base, the world should condemn her."

Comment from Japan and Malaya tends to fall into a similar "no, but" type of analysis, with criticism of the U.S. focused primarily upon the "provocativeness" of the U.S. action and the fearful consequences which might result from it. A columnist in Asahi, Japan's number one paper, thus labeled the U.S. move to sink any Soviet ship refusing to be inspected as a "brinkmanship policy" that was "too violent", while at the same time admitting that "we can understand the fears of America over the construction of Soviet missile bases in Cuba as it is tantamount to jabbing a pistol in your side". The influential Straits Times of Kuala Lumpur retreated somewhat from its hastily drawn analogy between Suez in 1956 and the Cuban crisis, but still opined that "there was a better course of action than the part Mr. Kennedy chose". The Times went on to find the resolution put forward by the O.A.S. as "quite reasonable", and concluded by saying that although the UN can hardly formally approve the quarantine, "...it surely must regard the Russian build-up in Cuba as a threat to the Americas" which will "...face it with the need to restrain Castro and Russia".

Communist China: Editorials run today in Ta Kung Pao and Worker's Daily repeat pledges of Chinese support of the Cuban "struggle" against U.S. "war provocations" and boast that the U.S. quarantine is doomed to failure. In the words of Ta Kung Pao: "U.S. imperialism is, after all, a paper tiger." Like People's Daily earlier, U.S. action in this instance is described as a mere extension of the abortive 1961 Cuban invasion.

Editorial comment from Peking continues to avoid reference to Soviet involvement in the crisis.

Note: Reports from Burma made available at the last moment indicate that pro-West papers have supported the U.S. action while neutrals have tended to straddle the issue. The Guardian, which often reflects the views of the Burma Army, took no sides and concluded that the one hope is to take the issue to the UN.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Critical comment on the U.S. action continued to appear in media throughout much of the Near East and South Asia. Mild optimism that a peaceful solution could be found was mentioned in some Middle Eastern papers. Hope was expressed, too, that both the U.S. and the Soviet Union would exercise restraint or that some solution could be found through the U.N., although some Indian newspapers were skeptical of the latter possibility. In NATO Greece and Turkey, and in Iran and Israel, some papers expected that the Soviet Union would back down in the face of U.S. determination. A few Indian papers, however, thought the USSR would gain, rather than lose prestige by turning its ships back.

South Asia

Heavy editorial comment from India has been predominantly critical of the US quarantine of Cuba, questioning the validity of the US justification, and indicating that domestic election campaign pressures from both Democrats and Republicans to take stronger action on Cuba have finally been too much for the President to resist. Even if the US charges concerning Cuban missile bases are true, the US has similar missile bases adjacent to the USSR, many commentators have continued to point out. Charges that the US was violating international law also continued to be made.

There is a considerable fear that war will break out if there is a US-USSR naval confrontation. The big question was what action the Soviet Union would take on the blockade. While a few papers believed the USSR would send its ships on through the blockade, one or two editorials said that Russia need have no fear of losing face by turning back -- that it would gain rather than lose prestige by such action. Restraint on both sides was urged. A few papers hoped that the UN could do something quickly to alleviate the critical situation, but an almost equal number saw little prospect of effective UN action.

Press comment from Pakistan has been very limited. The Leader termed US action "rash and panicky." Still crystalizing articulate public reaction ranges from enthusiastic support for the US to concern that possible hostilities between the US and USSR will endanger world peace.

Arab States and Israel

Official Arab reaction, where available, was to oppose all blockades and foreign military bases, to condemn the U.S. for endangering the peace of the world, and to urge action through the U.N. News media coverage in the Arab world has generally been balanced, except in Iraq, while comment has ranged from mild criticism to strong condemnation of the U.S., and has otherwise echoed the official line in language which, for the Arab world, has been restrained. Indications are that public opinion has tended to lean toward the Cuban people, although there are many anti-Castro elements in the Arab countries and some elements that have even applauded the U.S. move. In Israel, the press and public have almost unanimously supported the U.S. position.

While some Arab papers have termed the Cuban developments no more than part of the propaganda war (e.g., An-Nahar, Beirut) and have even seen a ray of hope in the crisis (e.g., Damascus media and Lebanese papers), many accused the U.S. of violating international law and using strong-arm tactics. The most critical comment came from the Iraqi press and from Premier Qasim, who pointed out that the U.S. is the only country that has used nuclear weapons in earnest so far.

In Israel, on the other hand, the strong U.S. stand was applauded as giving hope of stopping Khrushchev's salami tactics and restoring the balance of power. In the light of the U.S. mood, said Labor paper Davar, the U.S. reaction to the dangerous Russian provocations has been comparatively restrained. The cynics who call the move an election stunt, the paper added, are making a poor joke. Expecting the Soviet reaction to come in Europe, the Israeli press urged that a Summit meeting be called.

Non-Arab Middle East

Despite a continuation of general approval of the President's decision in Greek and Turkish media, a restrained tone of criticism appeared in several Turkish and Iranian papers. More significantly, a few editorial writers in Greece, Turkey and Iran began expressing mild optimism that the crisis would not result in nuclear war.

Optimism was along these lines: Both sides will exercise prudence so as not to escalate the crisis (Kathimerini, Athens; Peloponnese, Patras; Seda-ye-Mardom, Tehran); the issue will be

solved in the United Nations, or by negotiation (Radio Athens; Messimyriani, Athens; Ethnos, however, wondered if the UN could survive its gravest strain); The Soviet Union will back down in the face of such a strong stand by the United States (Ethnos; Peloponnese; Farman, Tehran; Egce Postasi, Istanbul).

Turkish editorial criticism of the United States contended either that the present crisis over Cuba was the result of past U.S. policies toward Cuba or that the President's action now provides the USSR with an excuse to take action in Asia and Europe. Iranian editorial criticism either advanced the latter contention, or argued that the quarantine could not be invoked in peacetime without violating international law. It was also suggested that the US, for the selfish reason of protecting its own shores, was risking the chance of plunging the entire world into a nuclear holocaust.

AFRICA

The extensive media news treatment continues to be wide-spread while the volume of editorial comment, mostly unfavorable to the U.S., is rising. The "extreme danger" of war is of growing concern and there are pleas for UN action. Important themes include doubts about the honesty of American claims and the degree of danger if true, the existence of U.S. military bases around the Soviet Union, the "illegality" of the blockade, and support for the independence of "small nations." To date there has been minimal reference to possible repercussions in Berlin. Only a few papers have defended U.S. actions.

News coverage of Cuban developments remains heavy throughout Africa while the volume of editorial comment is increasing. There is exceptionally little available official reaction.

The danger that the crisis could escalate into nuclear war is increasingly noted. It is accompanied by appeals for caution on the part of the principals and for UN action.

Editorial comment, mostly unfavorable to the U.S., has been most prominent in some of the Casablanca states and Tunisia. Media in these countries have been the most forthright in expressing "solidarity" with Cuba.

The government-run Ghanaian Times stated that efforts to topple the Castro regime would amount to the "lynching of a small nation ... by a large power drunken with intolerance and its own might." The paper doubted that Cuba is a military menace to the "nuclear giant," and stated that the Soviets have as much right to fortify Cuba as "NATO does to establish military bases around the Soviet Union." Addressing the UN Security Council, the representative of Ghana criticized the American "threat to Cuba" and expressed "doubt that proof has been offered of Cuba's offensive designs."

The media and government spokesmen in Algeria have publicly expressed "solidarity" with Cuba. El Shaab, organ of the National Liberation Front, editorially stated that Cuba is "gravely threatened" by the attempt to "turn a small nation from the course of socialism it has freely chosen."

The Arabic-language press in Morocco, the (official) Ethiopian Herald and Ethiopian government spokesmen have sharply criticized American actions. The Herald stated that "tiny Cuba" is merely trying to protect "her inalienable rights" while the U.S. "is determined to take drastic action" to bring down the government.

The Herald and a few other papers and spokesmen have said the U.S. should have gone before the UN before taking unilateral action and have urged withdrawal of the blockade.

Support for the U.S. has come from only a few papers in East and Central Africa and from one relatively unimportant paper in Nigeria. The European-owned, pro-African Rhodesian weekly, the Central African Post, stated the "Americans are justifiably worried" and upheld the blockade as the "minimal action" the U.S. could have taken. The unimportant Daily Telegraph in Lagos, Nigeria said the Cuban people had gone astray and that "Cuba has no moral right to constitute herself a dangerous stepping stone for the advancement of international communism."

SOVIET UNION

Soviet media output continues to maintain the impression of a U.S. -Cuban, rather than a U.S. -Soviet, conflict. As a corollary of the vehement Soviet reaction to the quarantine, Moscow is stressing that the U.S. has undertaken a dangerous and aggressive path in its relations with "small" Cuba, whose independence it has long sought to stifle. As to a Cuban "threat," Moscow continues to claim it doesn't exist.

At the same time, the Soviet Union is depicting itself as desirous of averting a thermonuclear war but capable of repelling any "imperialist-instigated" aggression. What appears to be the first public elite saber-rattling was done by Malinovsky, who repeated earlier Soviet claims of global rockets and boasted of nuclear warheads ranging from "small caliber to bombs of 50-60 megatons and more."

In response to the President's original charges that the USSR has supplied Cuba with "offensive weapons," Moscow now accuses the U.S. of outright fabrications. TASS supported such a charge by noting that "facts cited at the Security Council confirmed that the U.S. has been preparing for the present piratical actions for a long time." TASS also cited an alleged UPI report that U.S. officials do not have "incontrovertible" intelligence data regarding the presence of nuclear rockets in Cuba.

That Moscow seeks to impress the world public with a show of reasonableness and concern perhaps is reflected in its wide dissemination of Khrushchev's reply to Bertrand Russell, in which he said that the USSR "will not take any reckless decisions." No Soviet comment has yet been heard on U Thant's bid.

EUROPEAN SATELLITES

The Cuban crisis continues to dominate Satellite broadcasts, all of which are stressing that the United States has embarked on a dangerously aggressive policy. While anti-American vituperation

characterizes much of the propaganda output, the East European governments have continued to maintain a cautious stance. The only break from this attitude has appeared in a Czech news agency report which implies that crews of Polish ships headed for Cuba "have decided" to ignore the blockade.

POLAND

As the last of the East European Satellites (exclusive of Albania), the Polish government has now issued its declaration on the U.S. measures against Cuba. It calls the measures unprecedented in peacetime and another link in the series of aggressive steps against Cuban sovereignty. But while using legal arguments and deploring the danger inherent in U.S. moves "at a time when negotiations aimed at the solution of the most urgent international problems were in progress," the statement refrains from any pejorative epithets and concludes on a hopeful note that peace and "the sovereignty of nations" will prevail. That Polish authorities were gravely concerned by the danger of a general war was also confirmed by "competent sources" in Warsaw, according to Arthur Olsen's report from Warsaw carried by today's New York Times. This concern may have been aggravated by the fact that three Polish ships were headed toward Cuba, one of which (as reported by Hamburg DPA) was the first Bloc vessel approaching the quarantine zone. (Just now the Prague news agency CTK reports from Warsaw that "crews of Polish ships have decided" -- a phrase which implies spontaneous reaction, not a government order -- to continue normal operations on Cuban shipping routes "regardless of United States piracy.")

Olson also reported that public reaction was restrained and that there was no panic buying. But though this might have been true on October 23 and 24, REUTERS reported from Warsaw on October 25 that Warsaw's Central Food Distribution authority imposed temporary restrictions on the sale of sugar, flour and fats "to halt war-scare hoarding."

RUMANIA

Rumania's coverage of the events appears to have so far relied entirely on foreign, especially Soviet sources. Even the government declaration, as carried on Bucharest radio's domestic program on October 24, is rather brief and mild in tone. It is possible that the absence of

Gheorghiu-Dej (who returned to Bucharest only on October 24) accounted for this caution. On the other hand, however, the Rumanian U.N. representative on the Security Council, Mircea Malitza, was quite forceful in his accusations against the U.S. at yesterday's session of the Council. He asserted that the U.S. seized upon the alleged threat from "the small country of Cuba" only to hide the true reason for its "efforts to strangle Cuba," namely, "the hate of the imperialist circles in the U.S. toward the Cuban political regime."

EAST GERMANY

Reaction to U.S. measures in the Caribbean has been mounting steadily in the Soviet zone. It has also taken a new form -- more vituperative, but still defensive. So far, mass media in the Soviet zone has followed closely the USSR lead, calling the Americans "pirates" whose quarantine "is trampling underfoot" all rules of international law. In lengthy commentaries for domestic consumption, Radio East Berlin tried on several occasions to bypass the real issue of the Cuban question -- the deployment of intermediate ballistic missiles in Cuba. In its arguments, Radio East Berlin "quoted" even the U.S. assistant secretary of State for Latin America as saying that Soviet rockets in Cuba "were comparable to NIKE or MATADOR rockets (which have a range of about 10 to 15 miles, while Florida is 90 miles from Cuban shores).

Another noteworthy development in East Germany has been the visit of Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko to East Berlin. While repeating Soviet demands for a withdrawal of Western forces from West Berlin, Mr. Gromyko kept a complete silence on Cuba. There was no mention of Cuba in the official communique on the meeting between Gromyko and Ulbricht.

ALBANIA

Following a lengthy, and rather factual, report on the President's speech and on subsequent developments, Radio Tirana told its listeners on October 23 that "all U.S. propaganda is built on the completely unfounded allegation that the Soviet Union is creating a danger to peace and thus has made the U.S. measures necessary." On October 24, all Albanian papers carried reports on the blockade declaration, the Soviet government statement, Castro's emergency

proclamation, and Cuba's call for a U.N. Security Council meeting, using such headlines as "American Imperialism's New Warmongering Act against Peace and Mankind" and "American Imperialism again Threatens Cuba, the Peace and Security of the Peoples," etc. Radio Tirana in commenting on the events on October 24 no longer made any mention of the USSR.

HUNGARY

Hungarian media, on October 24, launched an extensive anti-U.S. propaganda campaign on the Cuban issue, charging, among other things, that the President is using the crisis to restore the sagging power of the Democratic Party in the upcoming elections.

YUGOSLAVIA

Yugoslavia media continue to give heavy coverage to the Cuban crisis. Following the line established by Tito's declaration yesterday, the leading Belgrade dailies, Borba and Politika, censured the U.S. decision to quarantine Cuba as "extremely dangerous" and requested urgent intervention by the United Nations.

Criticizing the quarantine of Cuba as "a unilateral aggressive act," Politika added that the present crisis "cannot be regarded apart from relations between the big powers." Another important Belgrade paper, Borba, questioned the wisdom of seeing in "a putative armament of Cuba a real danger to the security of the United States" and compared the present military build-up in Cuba with the existence of NATO bases. According to Borba the problem does not lie in Cuba but "in the intensive armament in every field and in every hemisphere."